UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

1)Clyde Scott,

v.

Plaintiff. : Civil Action No.: 19-cv-433-TCK-JFJ

1) Monarch Recovery Management, Inc., : COMPLAINT AND

Defendant. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

· :

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Clyde Scott, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

- 1. This action arises out of Defendant's repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* ("FDCPA") in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.
 - 2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendant transacts business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

- 4. The Plaintiff, Clyde Scott ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 5. Defendant Monarch Recovery Management, Inc. ("Monarch"), is a Pennsylvania business entity with an address of 10965 Decatur Road, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19154, operating as a collection agency, and is a "debt collector" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

- 6. The Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation (the "Debt") to an original creditor (the "Creditor").
- 7. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a "debt" under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).
- 8. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Monarch for collection, or Monarch was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.
- 9. The Defendant attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in "communications" as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. Monarch Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

- 10. Within the last year, Monarch began calling Plaintiff's cellular telephone number 918-xxx-3233, using an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS"), in an attempt to collect the Debt.
- 11. When Plaintiff answered calls from Monarch, he heard silence and had to wait on the line before he was connected to the next available representative.
- 12. On or about May 16, 2019, Plaintiff spoke with a live representative and informed Monarch he was on social security and disability and requested Monarch cease placing calls to him.
- 13. Nevertheless, Monarch continued to place automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number in an attempt to collect the Debt.
 - 14. Such action caused Plaintiff a great deal of frustration and distress.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

- 15. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendant's unlawful conduct.
- 16. As a direct consequence of the Defendant's acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

- 17. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 18. The Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(1) in that Defendant contacted the Plaintiff at a place and during a time known to be inconvenient for the Plaintiff.
- 19. The Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendant engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.
- 20. The Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendant caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.
- 21. The Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e in that Defendant used false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of a debt.
- 22. The Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendant employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.

3

- 23. The Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendant used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.
- 24. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendant constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.
 - 25. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

COUNT II

<u>VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT – 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.</u>

- 26. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 27. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants called Plaintiff's cellular telephone number using an ATDS or predictive dialer.
 - 28. Defendants' telephone system(s) have some earmarks of a predictive dialer.
- 29. When Plaintiff answered calls from Defendants, he heard silence before Defendants' telephone system would connect him to the next available representative.
- 30. Defendants' predictive dialers have the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator.
- 31. Defendants placed automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number despite knowing that it lacked consent to do so. As such, each call placed to Plaintiff was made in knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, and subject to treble damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- 32. The telephone number called by Defendants was and is assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs charges pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

- 33. Plaintiff was annoyed, harassed and inconvenienced by Defendants' continued calls.
- 34. The calls from Defendants to Plaintiff were not placed for "emergency purposes" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(i).
- 35. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each call in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 36. As a result of each call made in knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of treble damages in an amount up to \$1,500.00 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendant:

- 1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendant;
- 2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendant;
- 3. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each violation determined to be negligent pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);
- Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against the Defendant;
- Actual damages from the Defendant for all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
- 6. Treble damages for each violation determined to be willful and/or knowing pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C);

- 7. Punitive damages; and
- 8. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: August 6, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

By_/s/Sergei Lemberg

Sergei Lemberg, Esq. LEMBERG LAW, L.L.C. 43 Danbury, 3rd Floor Wilton, CT 06897

Telephone: (203) 653-2250 Facsimile: (203) 653-3424

E-Mail: slemberg@lemberglaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff